for Weisberg

28 Nov 69

Howard Roffman
Philadephia

Dear Howard:

I have your letter of 24 November, and letter to Harold and me concerning shirt slits.

Glad you got Frazier N.O. testimony in good shape. Copy what you wish. Later I shall send you a copy of my note to Weisberg on this; they are not extensive, but you may find some things useful.

I'll send you Finck's N.O. testimony later, after I learn whether Harold is going to comment on the notes I sent him. Presently I need the testimony for reference if he replies in detail. Keep Frazier's testimony as long as you have immediate use for it, but return it when you are finished; there is no great rush for me, but I would like it back after you have gotten what you want out of it.

Same for Finck's, after you get it.

No blood on 399: This is important, as you indicate, but consider other things also:

No fibers on 399: fibers often become embedded in or attached to bullets that pass through them. It's one of the things a firearms examiner always looks for, and often finds.

No fiber imprint on the nose of 399: This is probably more importnat than the two features mentioned above, for it involves a permanent feature of the bullet-- something that cannot be easily removed. When a bullet passes through fiberous material arranged in a pattern (as woven cloth), and the material has solid matter behind it against which it is pressed, then the pattern of the cloth is usually imprinted on the nose of the bullet-- sometimes the pattern is very distinct, sometimes not. I am not sure whether this happens regularly with full jacketed bullets, for their noses are much harder than lead tipped bullets, and I have not run tests. But I think it a very important thing to consider.

Fromt neck wound: An exit wound showing characteristics of an entrance wound can result only from the passage of a bullet of very low velocity; very, very low. As you indicate, all the characteristics of this wound are typical of entrance. My feeling exactly; I do not at all doubt that this is entrance.

An important question arises; one that I cannot answer. At what point was the shooter stationed? We have put him in front of the car, but should he not be visible in Willis 5 and/or Betzner 3? This has always puzzled me, for I would expect to see him. At least those pictures might allow us to eliminate certain locations. Think carefully on this matter, for although I have no answers, I think it important.

Zone of abrasion: I suggest you use some other means than the goat skin to illustrate this, for I do not see it in that picture, and I know what I am looking for. What you want is some illustration that clarifies verbal description, and the goat skin pictures do not. The illustrate the relative difference in size and shape in entrance and exit, but I do not see that they have bearing on the zone of abrasion.

Curry's book: Harold told me about this and about some of it's contents, but he did not indicate where I could get it. I asked him to arrange for getting a copy to me. You mention some things he didn't (he has not yet read it), and I'm glad to hear. I hope I can get it soon. Harold mentioned the picture of bullet fragment from Connally's arm, about haf the size of a .38 slug. If Curry's account of the origin of this fragment is true, it answers an important question for me-- something that I had supposed must have happened, but could not prove did happen. I had not mentioned this before, for it was purely a guess and not provable at the time. I think now that I was right.

What amazes me is that these people ("them" as opposed to "us") can make some exceedingly important disclosures and not ~~xxxxxx~~ not realize it's significance to us. For instance, the Panel's information about fragments in the neck area all by itself blows the WC version sky high, no matter what else does. It's a disclosure that they can easily have avoided by some circumlocution; instead they give us cannon fodder. Now this from Curry! It's blunders of this type that make me think that at least some of the ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ government's stooges are basically honest and do not fully understand what they are doing. I take that back for the Panel docs-- in the case of the neck fragments I think they were just plain stupid. It's one of the problems that "they" face in having experts who are not fully informed about thés case.

Shirt slits: I know about the nurses removing the upper garments before the operation, but it my recollection that Curricc loosened the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ tie and opened the shirt. I am not sure of this so please check it.

~~Frazier's~~

My notes to Harold on Frazier's testimony are enclosed. Copy them if you wish, and return them as soon as you can. I don't have another copy.

Disregard the "deal" mentioned in the note on p147ff. This needs some clarification, for I don't know who it is that Mary Ferrell overheard.

Still,

Bernabei

cc Weisberg